

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants	: SCHULTE et al.) I hereby certify that this paper (and/or
) fee) is being electronically deposited
U.S. Serial No.	: 10/754,812) with the United States Patent and
) Trademark Office on this date:
Filed	: January 9, 2004)
)
Title	: Resilient Retention System) March 6, 2008
	for a Door Panel)
)
) <u>/ Larry J. Palguta /</u>
Art Unit	: 3634) Attorney Name: Larry J. Palguta
) Registration No. 29,575
Examiner	: Gregory J. Strimbu) Attorney for Applicants

**RULE 132 DECLARATION
OF PETER S. SCHULTE, PERRY KNUTSON,
RODNEY KERN, BILL HOERNER, AND
ALLAN H. HOCHSTEIN**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

We, Peter S. Schulte, Perry Knutson, Rodney Kern, Bill Hoerner, and
Allan H. Hochstein, hereby declare and state:

1. We are the named inventors of the above-referenced patent application.
2. We are advised that the United States Patent & Trademark Office recently issued an Office action, dated September 6, 2007, rejecting claims 34, 38-42 and 45, 46, 48-54 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delgado et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2005/0076570) as applied to claims 31-33, 36, 37 and 44, and further in view of Linstadt (U.S. Patent No. 1,802,519). The Delgado Patent was

filed on April 19, 2004, and published on April 14, 2005. The Linstadt Patent was filed on April 2, 1928, and issued on April 28, 1931.

3. Independent claim 45 relates to a door comprising, inter alia, an upper track, a door panel, a lower track, a panel retention system and a resilient connection. Claim 45 specifies that the lower track is attachable to the wall such that no portion of the lower track extends into the path of pedestrian or vehicle travel. Further, claim 45 specifies that the panel retention system remains in contact with the lower track even if the impact exceeds a predetermined magnitude and the door panel moves out of the predetermined normal path.
4. We have reviewed the Office action's argument that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Delgado with a retention system, as taught by Linstadt, to enable the door to automatically return to its predetermined normal path. We disagree. Delgado describes a door, a rigid beam, a guide, and a guide follower, which is substantially rigid. Additionally, because these components are substantially rigid, the guided follower 23 is adapted to disengage and release the guide 22 when sufficient force is applied to the door panel 14 (pg. 3, para. 0043), and, thus, providing Delgado with a retention system goes against the specific teachings in Delgado.
5. If this teaching is ignored, providing Delgado with a panel retention system that remains in contact with the lower track even if the impact exceeds a predetermined magnitude and the door panel moves out of the predetermined normal path would require an inventive step (e.g., real innovation). These inventive steps, include, but are limited to:

positioning the panel retention system so that it does not create a tripping hazard or get damaged by vehicles traveling through or near the door; providing a resilient connection that prevents the door panel from deviating from a predetermined normal path if an impact force is not exceeded, but allows the door panel to deviate from the predetermined normal path when the impact force exceeds a predetermined magnitude without substantial damage to the panel or panel retention system; and providing a resilient connection that returns the door panel to the predetermined normal path when the impact force no longer exceeds the predetermined magnitude.

6. Linstadt states that “the primary object of this invention is to provide a barn door bottom track and guide which will effectively hold the lower part of the door in position against the door sill and which is of such construction that cattle passing over the sill will not damage the track” (pg. 1, 11. 4-10). To hold the lower part of the barn door in position against the door sill while preventing the barn door from binding during opening and closing, the barn door includes a holding member 12 that is coupled to the bottom of the barn door near the leading edge (i.e., the front edge of the door), which perpendicularly engages the bottom of the door face with a face strip 7 of the door sill 6, and, thus, a force is transmitted to the bottom front corner of the barn door. Additionally, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2 of Linstadt, to allow for the force to be transmitted to bottom front corner of the barn door in all door positions (e.g., an open and/or closed position), the holding member engages a lower track (8), which is disposed within the width of the doorway.

7. No where in Delgado and/or Linstadt describes a door including an upper track, a door panel, a lower track, a panel retention system and a resilient connection, where the panel retention system remains in contact with the lower track even if an impact exceeds a predetermined magnitude and the door panel moves out of a predetermined normal path. Further, no where in Delgado and/or Linstadt describes a lower track that is attachable to a wall such that no portion of the lower track extends into the path of pedestrian or vehicle travel. There is no teaching or suggestion that the combination of Delgado and Linstadt would result in a Resilient Retention System for a Door Panel that has the claimed characteristics. Further, the Office action fails to provide a rationale for combining Delgado and Linstadt.
8. An example falling within the scope of this claim is found in the specification, for example, FIG. 1 of our application illustrates a track follower 44 that is disposed above the floor that can slide or otherwise move along a lower track 42 that is disposed entirely outside the width of the doorway. "If an external force 60 forces panel 14 beyond its predetermined normal path 62 (FIG. 5), elongate member 56 is pulled out from within tube 50, which stretches spring 48. The resulting tension in spring 48 and elongate member 56 resiliently and automatically returns panel 14 back to its normal path 62 once force 60 is removed" (pg. 3, para. 58). Still further, to adjust the preload or initial load in spring 48, the distance between lower end 58 and track follower 44 can be adjusted by using a conventional buckle or clasp 66 to vary the effective length of elongate member 56 (pg. 3, para. 59).

9. In developing the Resilient Retention System for a Door Panel, we researched and tested a wide variety of springs, straps, cables, and other unique components. Additionally, we researched and tested how to optimally package and position the panel retention system and the resilient connection to avoid creating a tripping hazard or damage the panel retention system by vehicles traveling through or near the door, which proved to be extremely challenging because we were positioning the panel retention system outside the doorway while providing the resilient connection with enough force to be able to prevent the door panel from deviating from a predetermined normal path if an impact force is not exceeded.
10. Additionally, providing either Delgado or Linstadt with a panel retention system that has a lower track that is entirely outside the width of the door would have proven difficult and create unpredictable results, because, instead of having a force act directly on the bottom front corner of the door, as in Linstadt, the force comes entirely from outside of the doorway. Additionally, it would have proven difficult to provide a resilient connection with enough force to be able to prevent the door panel from deviating from a predetermined normal path if an impact force is not exceeded while still providing sufficient resiliency to allow the door panel to deviate from the predetermined normal path when the impact force exceeds a predetermined magnitude.
11. Evidence in the industry that there was a persistent defect in the prior art that is solved by as the Resilient Retention System for a Door Panel includes, but is not limited to: past systems did not prevent the door

panel from deviating from a predetermined normal path if an impact force is not exceeded; and/or past systems did not return the door panel to the predetermined normal path when the impact force no longer exceeds a predetermined magnitude; past systems created a tripping hazard and/or were damaged by vehicles traveling through or near the door.

12. We understand that willful and false statements and the like are punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, and that such willful false statement may jeopardize the validity of this application and any patent resulting therefrom.

Date: 3-5-08

By:

Peter S. Schulte
Peter S. Schulte

Date: 3/5/08

By:

Perry Knudson
Perry Knudson

Date: 3-5-08

By:

Rodney J. Kern
Rodney Kern

Date: 3/5/08

By:

Bill Hoerner
Bill Hoerner

Date: _____

By:

Allan H. Hochstein

the Resilient Retention System for a Door Panel includes, but is not limited to: past systems did not prevent the door panel from deviating from a predetermined normal path if an impact force is not exceeded; and/or past systems did not return the door panel to the predetermined normal path when the impact force no longer exceeds a predetermined magnitude; past systems created a tripping hazard and/or were damaged by vehicles traveling through or near the door.

12. We understand that willful and false statements and the like are punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, and that such willful false statement may jeopardize the validity of this application and any patent resulting therefrom.

Date: _____ By: _____
Peter S. Schuke

Date: _____ By: _____
Perry Knutson

Date: _____ By: _____
Rodney Kern

Date: _____ By: _____
Bill Hoerner

Date: 3/5/08 By: _____
Allan H. Hochstein